



## Participant Survey Results

The #micities conference drew 131 registered attendees and speakers to the Michigan Union on October 4<sup>th</sup>, 2014. The participant survey came back with overwhelmingly positive feedback, as well as several constructive critiques about the event.

### Methods

The surveys were distributed at lunch, and made available throughout the day. Most questions were asked on a Likert scale. The final section of the survey was open-ended. Out of 131 registered attendees and speakers, 27 completed the survey. This means that the response rate was 20.6%.

### Highlights

This survey identified several strengths and weaknesses of the event. There was almost uniform high scores of the keynote presentation and the following panel discussion. This demonstrates strong interest in the invited speaker and topic of open data. The breakout sessions received more mixed ratings from participants, with some participants really enjoying some sessions, while others found the breakout sessions not to their liking.

Participants reported an increase in their knowledge about the intersection of technology and cities, increasing their average some 1.47 points on a 10-point scale, which shows that the conference fulfilled the goal of increasing awareness and knowledge of this topic.

Yet the conference can take several steps to improve. Respondents rated that they felt they had their questions sufficiently answered 57.4 percent of the time (S.2 Q.6), while 62.2 percent of people felt that they were unable to make meaningful connections in the conference (S.2, Q.9). This survey shows that if there is another conference, there should be greater attention taken towards connections, both between participants and experts, and among diverse groups of participants. In addition, the demographic diversity of the event could be improved. Like many technology-focused events, the audience did not resemble the population at large or the state of Michigan.

### Response Summary

1. How would you rate the following elements of the conference?	Please Circle One: (1 = low, 10 = high) Avg. (Stdev)
Keynote presentation	8.96 (1.30)
Panel discussion	8.88 (1.31)
Lightening talks	8.18 (1.39)
Session 1: (Aggregated)	8.18 (1.37)
Session 2: (Aggregated)	8.05 (2.31)
2. How would you rate your subject knowledge about the current and future intersection of technology and cities? ...	
... <b>prior</b> to this conference?	6.41 (1.87)
... <b>after</b> the conference?	7.88 (1.31)

Scale:  
1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Neither agree nor disagree, 10 = Strongly Agree

3.	I learned a lot.	6.03 (0.94)
4.	I was able to share my views and opinions with others.	6.07 (0.96)
5.	Other participants at the conference listened to what I had to say.	6.19 (0.96)
6.	I was able to get answers to the questions I had.	5.74 (1.13)
7.	The conference encouraged creativity and new ideas among participants.	6.3 (1.14 )
8.	I know the next steps to take in order to learn more about these concepts.	6.56 (.89)
9.	I made meaningful connections with other participants.	6.22 (1.12)
10.	A diverse range of viewpoints were considered.	6.00 (1.24)
11.	I would support recommendations created by the participants of this conference.	6.33 (0.96)
12.	I would go to another conference on this topic.	6.44 (.85)

13. At this conference, which stakeholder group do you represent?

- 3/10.7% - Local Government
- 2/7% - State Government
- 3/10.7% - Private company
- 14/50% - College or University student
- 3/10.7% - College or University faculty or staff
- 0/0% - Non-profit
- 2/7% - None/Citizen
- 2/7%- Other sectors included regional government and people who worked on urban policy

(some marked two categories)

14. What is your sex?

- 12/ 43% - Female
- 16/57% - Male

15. What is your age?

Average age: 28.77 (8.27)

16. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- 0/0% - Some high school
- 0/0% - High school/GED
- 1/3.5% - Some college
- 0/0% - Associate degree
- 14/50% - Bachelors degree
- 12/43% - Graduate or professional degree

17. Are you of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin?

- 2/7% - Yes
- 25/90% - No

18. What is your race? *Mark one or more boxes.*

- 17/61% - White
- 0/0% - Black or African American
- 0/0% -American Indian or Alaska Native
- 5/17.8% - Asian
- 0/0% - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- 3/10.7% - Multiple races
- 1/3.5% - Some other race

Desired involvement after the conference:

- 24/27 people would attend the conference again (85.7%)
- 16/28 would attend a related event (57%)
- 16/28 would receive a list of reports, articles, or books on related topics (57%)
- 12/28 would participate in a session at the Michigan Association of planning or other professional conference (42.8%)
- 10/28 would take a UM class (36%)
- 8/28 would join a new organization (28.5%)
- 8/28 would participate in a webinar (28.5%)

19. What did you like most about the conference?

- “Approachable size, open and friendly participants”
- “Project based presentations and practical applications”
- “The broad number of topics within the realm of cities, and the diversity of the speakers/participants present at the conference. Especially excited to see women panelists!”
- “The focus on local cities specifically/opportunity to hear "on the ground" projects, interesting tech & the city/presentations & content were extremely relevant to the #micities concept/blending of academic and professional people, projects, and ideas”
- “Broad range of presenters, networking opportunities, good organization”
- “The mix of topics and presenters. Even though I didn't know a lot about tech/data, the conference still felt "accessible”
- “Engaging with other attendees in discussion around conference topics”

20. What components of the conference do you think could be improved?

- “wider audience (demographics), market to students at other schools”
- “guidance to different sessions/instruction/advertising”
- “learning of key trends, challenges/greater breakdown of application functions and feedback by public/consumers”
- “More international research”
- “More interactions between speakers and audience”
- “More info prior to the event regarding logistics---I didn't know breakfast would be provided or that I should bring cash for the cash bar. Would also appreciate more time for discussion in small groups”
- “longer---wanted more!”
- “Better advertising and outreach to attract a larger, more diverse crowd/more engagement opportunities between participants”
- “More government presenters---actual department folks that are practicing this day-to-day”
- “Facilitation/moderation of lunch discussions could have been helpful”